P.L. 173-92

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1891-92

192 .

(4-4)

File No. LR 159-91

Serial Nos.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos. 1-7

Part B for

SUBJECT.

Claim of the Ryots of Chandrahalli &c Villages of Chinthamani Taluk for Remission of Revenue assessment on Panchama Hirve private Cultivation

To,

1 The Supdt. of Rev. Survey in Mysore

2 The Dy. Comr. Kolar District.

No. 1325-6 — B. 10.1.02. LR 159-91-7

P.L. 173-92

Sanctioning Remission of the assessment on the Lands under certain private lands in Chinthamani Taluk

WD 223—GPB—20,000—11-6-20

Petition No. 3336 / 21-1-92
C.No. 1555

Petitioner - [illegible]

Subject

[illegible]

+ Tank No. 474.

I

1. On 13-1-92 [illegible]

2

been stopped and full elephants working. He [illegible]
-covered from him - that he had realised two
Dhanam documents and that he would deliver
the teeth at his [illegible]. The petitioner prayed
that permission might be obtained accord-
-ing to manual -

2. The Dhanam Superintendent forwarded the above petition and its enclosures to the Auditor and called for detailed information on the following points :- No. 650 of 31-1-90

(1) When was the Pandiam pidi Dhanamadu Dhanam referred to [illegible] granted and according to whose order?

(2) Till when was the Dhanam continued?

(3) Whether license [illegible]?

(4) In case of its resumption to [illegible], when, why and under whose orders it was resumed?

3. The Auditor reported that it was mentioned in the Dhanamadu [illegible] of the year [illegible] that the teeth for which Pandiam pidi and [illegible] were being allowed - that since then the Dhanamadu was being given one-fifth share both in the [illegible] and [illegible] pen-dance - that during the year (1087-88) the Survey Settlement was held - that since then full elephant was being allowed - that there was no dispute in the matter till then and that according to the orders received from the [illegible] he has prepared and submitted a statement showing the extent of the [illegible] [illegible] the [illegible] No. 579 of 27-2-90. [illegible]

as the Inams were not forthcoming in-
-formed the Inam Supdt. that no Settle-
-ment seems to have been made of the
lands - that Rev. of Govt. No. 4020/88 of 30-7-77
published in page 71/58 of the Inam Com: Manual
of 1886 states that settlement of Inams Kodagi
Engaged in Lieu had been effected - that if he
was informed of the details of settlement it
would be convenient for him to explain his
views about the matter under reference -

No. 111 of 3-6-92

8. The Inam Supdt. in reply pointed
out that Govt. Rev. No. 4020/88 above referred
to was passed in reply to the correspondence
of Kodagi Inams Engaged in Lieu and sub-
-ported by Jari Inams - that the Revision
Supdt. could not refer to it as of
the above nature - that it might be pleased
to be referred by him to Kodagi of [illegible]
lands - that if he wanted to know about
the Kodagi Inams engaged in Lieu and
settled in accordance with the above Rev.
Reg. 4020/88, letter No. 708 of 31-5-77 addressed
to Govt. by the Survey and Inam Comm
and published just above the Rev. above
referred to might be further seen - that it
should be settled in accordance with the views
expressed in para 5 of that letter and
that the views might be requested in his
Yadi No. 584 about the present question
which had been pending for a long time
might be furnished -

Note

Kodagi Inams.

The Inam Supdt further requested the Asst: Comm: to favour him (Inam Supdt) with his (Divisional) views as requested in Yadi No: 584 (paras) as the question of the Inams had been pending from a long time.

Put the Note

I do not understand

No. 573 of 6-7-92

9. On 6-7-92 the Asst. Comm: informed the

6

Ramalingh has his lands pieces
in the Cossipore and Pergunnah Kasipore
lands for which Government has assessed
Lakhiraj - but when Government has given
Sirdari, Ramalingh has claimed
from Government the Kasipore Lands
Government will therefore have to
examine the lands in question
Date and last in Board's proceed-
-ings of the Revenue, which are the grounds
on which the Board decided to grant
Ramalingh the Lands in question
Letter from Board to Collector
before finally -

Ans. Cor 29-7-32 The Board's proceedings
the above correspondence with Ramalingh
with a request that the Lands in question
may be examined by Jamabandi
Letter from the Collector, relating to Government
lands -

Note. The file contains the correspondence
noted in the Superintendent's
Register in page 6 of the Register -

File No. 2 relates to Ramalingh's appointment
as Kasipore -

Ans. Cor 12-7-32 Collector's Proceedings
The Board's decision, referring to
the Lands in question, requiring
information regarding the
Lakhiraj grants in favour of the
Zamindar of Kasipore

the Lands

of only the amount
of reduced assess
ment in the event
for remission of
the public of the assessment

Also with the Lands
in the Northern of the
Kasipore ?

Ans. Cor 29-7-32.

dated from 4
1825 & 1826

2 Petitions
3 Memorial from Ramalingh
3. Order 4/1877-28
4 Petition from Ramalingh 1879-79
5 Receipt 4/1874-28

+ Jamabandi No. 436

See p 37 of the Papers
relating to Kodiyar Inams

Do. 480 of 5-4-90
399 of 24-10-90
579 of 9-12-90

Do. 218 of 29-7-92

Effect.

Venkata Rao applied for land below Bramanandasagar [illegible] at Khandri-halli (now belonging to [illegible]halli) - The statement [illegible] by you personally along with the Villamadar was gone through.

Now, [illegible] for this land [illegible] is paid in kind - [illegible], [illegible] Kandayam land from the [illegible] there is an extent 1-3-2-8 land - The yield [illegible] both from Kandayam and [illegible] amount Rs. 169/= the average annual [illegible] is Rs. 17/= Deducting Rs. [illegible] [illegible] amount being the amount of Kandayam fixed for [illegible] from the said amount the balance of Rs. 9/= [illegible]. The rate of assessment prevailing in the village is [illegible] per [illegible]. The statement above [illegible] to -

The Villamadars, who had appeared in person, stated that they did not want the land for Kandayam.

If assessment is fixed on the land according to the village rates [illegible] for [illegible] it would amount to Rs. 13/= which is more than its [illegible] average.

The [illegible] represented that he should be given [illegible] and the land that is also given out on Kandayam in the same way as is being done in case

Note:- The Inhabitants state that Lewinewidi village was formerly in the place of Chandra-halli village and that it is now an inhabited village.

IV / VI

File No. 4, relates to lands Nos. 481 and 482 Manvaikere and attikere, tank of Chandrehalli.

17. Jamasrappa, Subbarayappa, Mallappa and others - Inamdars of the above lands submitted a petition to the Government on 2-9-90 stating that in consideration of their incurring money for building and repairing the tanks, the Lease-rate for them is being given one-fifth share of the revenue to them by the Government as well as of the state, further that they having been given Durkhast No. 7 [illegible] of 22nd May and 2nd June 1868 respectively by the Revenue Sub-Division to state that by Government orders [illegible] all the land of the whole of the said tanks and desiring that after deducting one-fifth share of the total amount of Kandayam and the balance they be credited for and that out of the land by the holders on these lands ditto should according to Jamabandi be made for Inamdars that they had also Indented three sheets of the Inam Taktis of the [illegible] Received from preferred and submitted by their ancestors with effect that the same and if the accounts and the papers were [illegible] it would be apparent that, remaining

At Stellenbosch Meeting the Board considered the following Letters received since last Meeting, and resolved that the Secretary be instructed to write to the Writers as follows -

No. 897 of 27-11-90. 1. To Mr Smithers re, applying for Grant of Erven 1 & 2 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erven are required for Municipal purposes -

2. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 1 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

3. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 2 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

4. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 3 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

5. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 4 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

6. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 5 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

7. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 6 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

8. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 7 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

9. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 8 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

10. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 9 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

11. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 10 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

12. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 11 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

13. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 12 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

14. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 13 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

15. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 14 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

16. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 15 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

17. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 16 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

18. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 17 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

19. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 18 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

20. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 19 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

No. 217 of 29-7-90. 21. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 20 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

22. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 21 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

23. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 22 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

24. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 23 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

25. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 24 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

26. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 25 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

27. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 26 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

28. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 27 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

29. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 28 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

30. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 29 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

31. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 30 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

32. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 31 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

33. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 32 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

34. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 33 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

35. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 34 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

36. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 35 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

37. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 36 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

38. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 37 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

39. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 38 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

40. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 39 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

41. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 40 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

42. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 41 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

43. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 42 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

44. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 43 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

45. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 44 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

46. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 45 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

47. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 46 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

48. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 47 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

49. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 48 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

50. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 49 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

51. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 50 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

52. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 51 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

53. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 52 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

54. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 53 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

55. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 54 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

56. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 55 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

57. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 56 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

58. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 57 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

59. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 58 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

60. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 59 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

61. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 60 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

62. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 61 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

63. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 62 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

64. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 63 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

65. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 64 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

66. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 65 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

67. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 66 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

68. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 67 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

69. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 68 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

70. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 69 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

71. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 70 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

72. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 71 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

73. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 72 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

74. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 73 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

75. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 74 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

76. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 75 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

77. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 76 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

78. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 77 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

79. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 78 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

80. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 79 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

81. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 80 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

82. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 81 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

83. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 82 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

84. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 83 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

85. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 84 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

86. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 85 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

87. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 86 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

88. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 87 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

89. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 88 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

90. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 89 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

91. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 90 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

92. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 91 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

93. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 92 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

94. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 93 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

95. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 94 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

96. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 95 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

97. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 96 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

98. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 97 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

99. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 98 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

100. To Mr Jan Rensburg Junr re, Erf No 99 Block H Stellenbosch Township - that the Board regret that it cannot accede to his request as the Erf is required for Municipal purposes -

21. Ne folgende Urkunden sind verloren
b. Von Ihnen Personen Repräsentierte
b. Die Urkunden:
1. Septbr. Urkunden Nr. 7 d. 22-8-68
2. do — do — Nr. 12 d. 2-6-68
3. Neue Zeitschrift für Landwirthschaft
4. Neue Zeitschrift für Thierheilkunde (1857-8)
5. Kladderadatsch 1873-84
6. Kalender f. 1863.
7. Kalender 1866
8. Kalender 1868
9. Kalender-Notiz 74-75
Die No. 3 gelöscht wird der Urkunden
475 Verschiedene andere Urkunden Bücher
- Manuscripte und Correspondenzen
respectively -
22. Cap. II - 3-30 Documents Various Corpo-
-rations, Municipalities Towns, Land Com-
missioners of Provinces of Dominion Lands
Instructions to the Dominion Land
Surveyors Act for Manitoba
6-17-72 Letters Patent in Trust Register
for Manitoba - Certificate of Registry
Winnipeg Nr. 140-4-3 Certificate for
Kalender which were Patented previously
in the Trust - Act and Certificate
Nr. 38 for Canada - Certificate of
Incorporation Nr. 3-15-, Act and Certificate
Which the Documents were Registered
Neue Zeitschrift Patent Office Registered
for Manitoba, Certificate of Nr. 4

No. 752 of 1936-2-39

24. The Circlekar in reply reported to the
effect that according to Farman No. 3479 of
9-11-65 the whole of the donation was given
to Desai Ramji Rao was reduced
a perpetual [illegible] in kotgi [illegible]
-tion of this claim to Dastavand -
that it was ascertained from the accounts
that the above rate of Dastavand was
being paid up to the year 1294 when the
survey settlement took place - that the original
[illegible] Dastavand was not forth-
-coming - that it was evident from the [illegible]
extracts of the Dy. Commr. [illegible] that the
fifth share was being paid in kind for lands
below the tank - that subsequent to 1865
the reduced [illegible] was being recovered
and not the Panchami [illegible] - that there was
no increase in the [illegible] subsequent to 1865
by [illegible] - that he had
enclosed the statement [illegible] for [illegible]
with the [illegible] of the Dy. Commr. [illegible]
of 1865 as the original [illegible] was not forth-
-coming - that it was ~~[illegible]~~ ascertained that the [illegible] had
got the lands from the [illegible] Ramji
Rao by sale -
25. The [illegible] Supdt. [illegible] from
the Circlekar that these lands were not included
in the list of [illegible] lands, which
he submitted to Survey Supdt. and putting
a statement in the prescribed form for-
-warded all the records to the Survey Supdt. — No. 216 of 29-7-92
with a view to settlement being effected
according to the rules of the Dy. Commr. — [illegible] file No. 378.

IX

X

(1)

No. 1 dtd 4-4-90

No. 7890 dtd 4-4-90

Petition 3336 / C 1553-91.
21-1-92
Serial No. 1 in the open file

[illegible]

30. Which correspondence was begun on [illegible] [illegible] and the [illegible] submitted a petition to Govt. stating that their ancestors built the above [illegible] - that they were getting [illegible] [illegible] in the [illegible] [illegible] below the [illegible] and the [illegible] [illegible] up to the year [illegible] when during the Survey Settlement the [illegible] was stopped - that whereupon they submitted a petition to Gl. Govt. who did not settle anything about the matter - that during the year the Dewan visited [illegible] when they personally submitted a petition to him - that he personally directed the Dy. [illegible] that the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] that the [illegible] has been sent to the [illegible] - that on this they submitted several petitions to Gl. Govt. and that no orders had as yet been passed and, praying that ~~[illegible]~~ might be passed for the [illegible] of [illegible] -

31. On 22-1-92 the above petition was sent to the Dy. [illegible] for [illegible] to petitioners and a copy of it for brief Report

C. No. [illegible] 1109/23-1-92
Serial No. 2

32. On 24-5-92 the [illegible] to whom the

Report for the information of Govt. Law. 22
the Assembly was informed by Law

40. On 20-12-92 the Secretary Legislative Assembly
the Assembly was informed by Law
received from the Private Secretary
dated 19th the Secretary
Legislative Assembly was informed
in the Assembly Secretariat
of the Assembly Secretariat
Secretary Legislative Assembly
Secretariat

Law. 53 of 20-12-92

Law. 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 214
Gazette of 29-7-92.

41. On 13-12-92 the Secretary Legislative
Assembly was informed by Law
to Law in the Assembly Secretariat
Secretary Legislative Assembly
Secretariat

Law. 712 of 13-12-92
Serial No. 11

42. On 22-3-93 the Secretary Legislative
Assembly was informed by Law
Secretary Legislative Assembly
Secretariat

Law. 79 of 22-3-93

43. In the Assembly Secretariat by the Secretary
Legislative Assembly was informed by Law
Secretary Legislative Assembly
Secretariat of Legislative
Secretary Legislative Assembly
Secretary of Legislative Assembly
Secretary of Legislative Assembly
Secretary of Legislative Assembly

1865-67

Rec. 855 fl 6 - 2 - 94

Rec. 875 fl 20 - 3 - 94

27

The Kodagina of Iguru Kunte, taluk No. 307 of Lakkavalli[illegible] Kunte, explains that [illegible] to the effect that he cannot [illegible] the land and that he is not in [illegible] of the permission – he has enclosed a statement furnishing the information called for in respect of the five lands [illegible] Nos. 484, 496, 498, 482 and 481.

+ o/3-5-95 in file No. 3.

No. 484 [illegible]
× 496 [illegible]
498 [illegible]
482 [illegible]
481 [illegible] – do.

It is [illegible] that these lands were in the possession of [illegible] by the [illegible] of the petitioners [illegible] two years ago. It has already been reported that the order relating to the grant of [illegible] [illegible] are not yet [illegible] either with the petitioners or in the [illegible] [illegible] 1888 there was [illegible] correspondence about these lands when the then [illegible] having learnt from enquiry that Kodagi-dars were [illegible] one-fifth share [illegible] from some of the lands [illegible] these lands already given out for [illegible] also [illegible] share in [illegible] land from the [illegible] and [illegible] [illegible] he fixed [illegible] on [illegible] [illegible] them to the [illegible] for [illegible]-gam and [illegible] to the [illegible] ~~to the~~ ~~[illegible]~~ to the effect that they should be [illegible] the fifth share [illegible] in the [illegible] [illegible] – he has enclosed [illegible] copies of the [illegible].

+ [illegible] No. 1250/2-5-85 referred to in No. 496
do – 79/22-5-85 – do – No. 498
do – 128/2-6-88 – do – No. 482
do – 76/22-5-85 – do – No. 481

It is clear from the [illegible] above re-ferred to [illegible] from the [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] 1888

the Recorder in the case of the first three from the Recorder and the Collector in case and from the Collector to the Public Treasurer from time to time as above from the Recorder received.

Interest money for Coin

And also that, pursuant to the said Act the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may from time to time direct that the Recorder shall receive gold coin at such rates as may be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and that the Recorder shall receive gold coin at the rates so fixed, and shall pay out gold coin at the rates so fixed.

gold measurement
Do not part in
when the lands passed
into the hands of the

And also that, pursuant to the said Act, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may from time to time direct that the Recorder shall receive gold coin at such rates as may be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and that the Recorder shall pay out gold coin at the rates so fixed.

It is evident from the Act, recently passed that the Recorder may thereby be required to receive Canadian gold coin at the rates fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Proposed that the Act passed in 1897 respecting the Collection of Revenue from Mines, and the Act passed in 1898 amending the same, be disallowed.

Recommended that the Act, passed in 1897, respecting the Collection of Revenue from Mines, be disallowed.

14-5-98 file No. 4.

[illegible] 1877 Lo. 139 of 30-6-98
Lorid. No. 16

Lo. 221
27-73-98 of 8-7-98.
Lorid Lo. 17

[illegible] Lo. 139 of 30-6-98.

Lo. 221 of 8-7-98.

+ of 16-7-98
Lo. 5.

1877-79

Lo. 221 of 27-7-98.

No. 4/1319-1-99

5/- The Secretary, Lift Irrigation Dte. Nagpur. Attention is invited to the Govt. letter under reference regarding the land tax. It may be stated that the claim were based on the land profile -

BK
14/7/99.

(58) Of the 10 cases entered in the list, remission of 1/3rd assessment on the lands under 6 No. tanks is recommended while in the other 4 cases no remission is recommended.

P.T.O

Taking first the cases in wh
Remission of 1/3rd assessments
recommended, it has to be
observed that these cases do
not ~~fall~~ come under the
rules relating to the Construction
of private tanks & wells (vide
p 187-94 of the Rev Manual
& p 223-25 of the Papers relating
to the L R Code pra/neri thereof)
or under the Rules in Appendix
F of the L R Rules throwing the
repair of such tanks upon private
enterprise.

(59) The tanks in question
are a species of Kodyi
tanks which ought to have
been settled by the Inam Dept
under para 8 of G.O. No
962/Rev 43 d 20/12/76 *

The Inam Dept settled
those cases in wh the
Kodayi dars were paid
in kind (vide paras 3 & 5 of
G.O. No 2402/258 d 20/7/77) but omitted to
settle those cases in wh they were paid in money.

* P 93, Rev Manual or
P 28 of the Papers relating
to Kodyi tanks.

x. P 30-32 of the Papers
relating to Kodyi Inams

Particulars concerning the holdings of the [illegible]

Remarks

The present assessment is claimed on principles and the particulars

From the last assessment has been received for [illegible]

The present assessment has been received for [illegible]

The Khalsa for 1877-78 also benefited.

The Khalsa Estates were assessed at the same

07-15- assessment till the Survey Settlement - copy of the

Sheet No. 125 is enclosed herewith -

Do — Do — Public Roads in Khalsa

-ports, which are included

Do — Do — Do —

Have been duly received for 15 years on the

16th April 1881 the Settlement Officer

Do — Public Schools in the 15 years found

in the Khalsa Estates also included for reference

In the Khalsa Estates the Rent-Roll for 1876-77,

of 13-8-1876 22-5-1878, which stated 15 years was

received in part only and the Rent-Roll was

15 years each, the Village Accountant has also

Do — The Record Committee with the 15 years

Survey Settlement, for the above

The Khalsa Estates in the Khalsa Estates

Khalsa Estates in 1877-78 the Record Committee

Khalsa Estates for

The Rent-Roll [illegible] for 15 years

in 1881

Have not been received

Have not been received for 15 years

Have been duly received for 15 years

Have been received for 15 years

for 15 years in the Khalsa Estates have not been received

15 years in the Khalsa Estates for 15 years

Statement showing the Taluks wise Land Revenue demand for the Fasli year 1334

Sl. No.	Name of Village	Registered No. of Khata	Total Extent of Land Acres	Total Extent of Land Cents	Annual Revenue Demand Rs.	As.	P.	Amount of Revenue Collected Rs.	As.	P.	Remarks
1	Sirinagapura Hosakere	484	—	—	100	8	—	20	—	—	Full
2	Kodagihalli Hanumanthanagara Kaval	496	—	—	39	4	—	7	12	—	Full
3	Lakshmidevihalli Agrahara	495	—	—	59	—	—	11	12	—	Full
4	Channahalli alias Kere	482	—	—	Lakshmi-narayana	235	12	—	47	—	—
5	Do	481	—	—	Do	43	12	—	8	12	—
6	Basavihalli Basavikere	500	—	—	Basavi	174	12	—	35	—	—
7	Doddamadihalli Bhadrikere	464	—	—	Byrappa	113	4	—	22	12	—
8	Lakshmidevihalli Agrahara	507	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
9	Lakshmanapura Kaval	478	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
10	Basavanahalli Basavikere	498	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note. All the Taluk Revenue demand [illegible] Effected in my Taluk.

& the Kodyr cases Nos
under discussion

(61). In the 6 cases under consideration, the original orders granting remission of 1/3 assessment are not forthcoming but there is evidence that such remission was granted till the Settlement. In 5 of these cases there are orders of the Dy Supt Mr Krishnaiyer sanctioning in 1868 the continuance of the remission In these 6 cases therefore the remission of 1/5 the assessment in the case of these lands held by the owners of the lands & the payment of 1/3 the assessment by the owners in the case of lands held by others may therefore be sanctioned. This will not have retrospective effect for the reason assigned by the Dy Comr that none of these lands has been entered

This omission appears to have been commissioned of the Diwan during his visit to Chintamanu in 1887 & hence his order & the Govt to "report such cases along with Chinthaya's case & the Sankey Tank" (037 of the Kodaji Nimm Papers)

(60). It was apparently in conformity with the above order that these cases reported Sorabji & (copies put up) were sent by the Sur Supt for the orders of Govt. These orders however do not distinguish clearly between the Chintaya Cases (which fall under the rule in Appendix E of the L.R. Rules

to be in good order in previous ~~the~~ years.

(62) ~~the~~ The 4 cases in which remission of rent recommended do not call for much remark. In 2 cases the owners admit having lost their right to the remission, & in another case the tank has been brought to Standard by the N W Dept. In the 4th case remission is not recommended because the tank is in repair In a similar case the Sol. observes "that this is not of much consequence as remission is to be granted on land which pays full rent assessment, the Sol. not being bound to repair the tank" (So. D 13/8/92) but that, if any of the

under them now under
occupation are relinquished
in consequence of the Tank
tank being out of repair
the remedies would be
withdrawn. If this principle
were applied to the 4th case
(Mavunkere tank) in which
the ambarahan has reported that
the tank repair does not interfere
with wet cultivation (para 5 of Precis)
remedies will have to
be granted in this case

(63). The claims in these
cases seem to fall under
para (10) (1) (c) of the Rules of
business viz "Claims to hold
land wholly or partially free from
payment of land revenue or to
receive payment charged on
or payable out of the land revenue"
& require therefore to be
decided by 2 Members of Council
There does not however seem to
be any necessity for a hearing

Mg. 5/8/25

100.

?

Please state the facts
of the several cases.
From the maps
now returned it
is impossible to form
any opinion as to the
conflicting claims.
Please send a brief
draft showing the evidence
forthcoming in each
case. I would also
reject the Petition
in terms of G.O. dated
3 March 1922.
Cannot quite make
out what is meant
by "to abandon
as to etc"
Please make
a draft
letter to me.

11/8/25

Mr. Secretary
Mr. Rayli
Regret the delay which
has unavoidably occurred
in preparation of this work
This will again be
submitted shortly with
your remarks

Yours
[illegible]

Rev
27.VIII.07

If Mr. Secretary falls
within para 10(1)(c)
of the Council Rules of
Business they have
to "be heard and decided
by two members of
Council" (Vide para
10(1)) In such
cases, under the
same Rule para(2)
(c) matters becoming
subject to appeal are entitled
to be heard - This two
— actions may be likely
to be matters of Public
or Parliamentary Interest
in charge in Britain

[illegible] Vara (2) (3) -
The Respt is not such
a case - Upstairs, the
other occupier who has
built [illegible] to ask
leave [illegible]
to keep [illegible] shed
and says "Make no
[illegible] claim."

(2) Vara II by
Counsel Notice
- Hearing 9/10
March 1907

This is a request
adverse [illegible] claim [illegible] Vara
Court [illegible] may
[illegible] petn does
[illegible] Vara
[illegible] for hearing
Upstairs - I can have
nothing to do with case
myself [illegible] Registrar to
[illegible] 30/8/07

Supt & 1st Council

The cases may be posted for
hearing: (There have been cases
in which orders have been
passed without hearing but the
parties do not seem [illegible] of this)

30/8/07

Post for hearing

30/8/07

30/8/07
[illegible]

[illegible] 2nd September
27/10/07

43

Before the Government of Mysore.

Pehs:
Appeal No. 333 of 1891-92

Appellant:	Vs.	Respondent.
Ranga Sastry & others of Chandrahally Bindanavanay Talug.		Nil

Claim for remission of ½ Revenue under Purchamakissa private Enterprize lands—

Posted to 1st Novr 1901

Adjd to 11th Decr 1901.

Subsd to 2nd Ctr

7/12/01

R. 10/12/01.

1195

Central Jail Press, Bangalore,—7-7-99.—802.

Chintamani
1655
1/1/92

Doc 3336.

459 Compl.ts 11c3 Re.

No.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.
RECEIVED.
REGD. No. 33360
DATE 28 1 92

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 1659

dated 21 1 92 received at the

Dewan's Office from [illegible]

[illegible]

is forwarded, together with its

enclosures, to the [illegible]

[illegible]

By Order,

BANGALORE,
28 1892.

Chief Secretary.

47

General Serial No. 30.)

1892. 1900.

From The Deputy Commissioner Kolar district. Ref 101

To The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 15th August 1892

Despatched 18th Do.

Received

Enclosures No. Triplicate

General No. 636

No 135

Reporting on the petition from the Ryots of Chandrahally &c. Chintamany Taluk.

Peon's Charges 1/8

Forward Copies of Mr Jones Report & his Sheriff's Rowl. Sheristadar & Peon to be forwarded to Report for Mr Jones of Gobbi. how the matter was disposed of by him.

24/8/92

To the Superintendent Surveys &c
5261 dt 11/10/92
P.7173-92

19/8/92 Rec'd 20/8

No: 636 dur 141 / 135 file

Deputy Commissioner's Office,

Kolar District,

Dated 15th / 16 August 1892

(7)

To

The Chief Secretary to the

Govt of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your official Memorandum No: 1169 dated the 23rd January last forwarding a petition from the ryots of Chandrabailu &c of the Chintamani Taluk, I have the honor to state that the papers connected with the application of the petitioners for remission of 5% of the assessment on the lands under their private enterprise. Lands having been referred to this office by the Inam Superintendent, I expressed an opinion that this request might be granted and that officer has since intimated in his Kannada yadi No: 236 dated 5th instant that the records have been sent to the Survey Superintendent for disposal accordingly.

herewith returned

2 A copy of the endorsement granted to the petitioners by me on the subject is herewith submitted for information.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant,

E Marshall

Deputy Commissioner

Submitted. 52

As the previous letter referred to was dealt with in the Pub Wks, this may also be transferred to that Dept.

Pub Wks 15/6/99.

Received 15/6/99

Rec'd 17/6 C.T. 173 of 92 containing the asp. is put up.

AK 17/6/99.

Submitted

Mills 20.6.99

Recd Ry 23/6/99

Submitted to Rev Cr's Dr with papers

Mills 15.7.99

Ry 5/8/99.

Devanpore 7/8/99

Vide Cr's orders on office Precis.

C&R 25/7/01.

13/4/01 291

7979

Pet 463 1899

From Executive Engineer, Chitaldroog

To

The Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,

Rev & C & Rev Dept.

Dated 7th June 1899

Despatched

Received

General No. 815

No.

Enclosure No. 2 files of 2 Cancelled.

In reply to ——

SUBJECT

Submitting statement showing certain private tanks in the village of Devanahalli Taluk for which [illegible] of the assessment the claims are recommended.

References
(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office)

15/6/99

5 C 2

No 815

Survey Superintendents Office
Bangalore 9th June
1899

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Genl and Rev Depts

Sir,

In continuation of this
Office Docket No 899 of 30th June
1895 I have the honor to for-
-ward a statement with the
Vernacular correspondence
received from the Deputy
Commissioner of Kolar, regard-
-ing certain private lands
in the village of Chandrahalli
Chintamani Taluk for which
1/5th remission of the wet
assess-

assessment is claimed, and
to recommend that the sug-
-gestions made by the Deputy
Commissioner may be adopted
if claims were made at the
time of Settlement.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
J. Hunt
Supt Mysore Rev. Survey

to be in good ~~order~~ repair & Govt: are pleased to direct the continuance of the remission of one-fifth the assessment in the case of lands under these tanks with the ~~exception~~ exception of Malvanakere. This will have effect from the current year as the tanks have not been certified to be in good order in previous years.

A Hindi list appended

4. It must be clearly understood and explained to the owners of the lands that if they fail to keep the tanks in good order the remission now sanctioned will be withdrawn and the lands taken under the management of Govt:

A 1325-6 & 10.1.02
& Z 173-92

Copies of the above are forwarded to the Secretary to the Govt: of India in the Revenue & Agriculture Department & the Govt: of Kolar D.C. Mysore

(together with the Hindi list sent with the D.C.'s letter No. S-15 & 9/1899)

A.C. Secretary.

The Superintendent of Revenue Surveys in Mysore, with records

The Dy. Comm. Kolar D.C.

Name of the Village	Name of tank	Regr. No.	Amt. of assd. of the lands under the tank			Remarks
Sreenivasapur	Hosakere	484	100	8	-	one-fifth remission
Kodigihalli	Hanumanta vayankunte	496	39	4	-	— Do —
Lakshmidevikote	Dyavarakere	495	57	-	-	— Do —
Chandrahalli	Attikere	482	235	12	-	— Do —
Mosihalli	Mosilkere	500	174	12	-	— Do —
Dodakonahalli	Bhoginkere	464	113	4	-	— Do —

Proceedings of the Government of Mysore, Petition, dated 11th January 1902.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

PRESENT:

V. P. MADHAVA RAO, ESQ., C.I.E.

AND

C. SREENIVASIENGAR, ESQ.

Appeal No. 1 of 1901-02.

Petitions Nos. 3336 and 1655 of 1891-92.

Subject.

Claim to the remission of one-fifth assessment of the lands under certain private Panchamahisse tanks in the Chintamani Taluk.

The facts of the case are clear from the following: -

Decision :

It appears from the records that while the remission of one-fifth assessment was claimed in the case of lands under private tanks, the claimants in the case of two tanks (Yerrakunte and Bidarekere) have since abandoned their claim owing to the disrepair of these tanks and that in a third case, the tank (Mosilkere in Nallamachanpalli) having been brought up to standard by the Public Works Department in 1881, the claim to remission is untenable.

2. In the other 7 cases, it appears that the owners of the tanks were allowed one-fifth remission till the survey settlement when the concession was withdrawn.

3. All these tanks with the exception of Chandrahalli Mavinakere are reported to be in good repair and Government are pleased to direct the continuance of the remission of one-fifth the assessment in the case of lands under these tanks, with the exception of Mavinakere (*vide* list appended). This will have effect from the current year as the tanks have not been certified to be in good order in previous years.

4. It must be clearly understood and explained to the owners of the tanks that if they fail to keep the tanks in good order, the remission now sanctioned will be withdrawn and the tanks taken under the management of Government.

No. 1325-6—P. F. 173-92, DATED BANGALORE, 11TH JANUARY 1902.

Copies of the above are forwarded to the Superintendent of Revenue Survey in Mysore and to the Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District, together with the records received with the Survey Superintendent's letter No. 315, dated 9th June 1899.

H. V. NANJUNDAYYA,
Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

Name of the village.	Name of tank.	Registered No.	Amount of assessment of the lands under the tank.	Remarks.
			Rs. a. p.	
Srinivaspur	Hosakere	484	100 3 0	One-fifth remission.
Kodigihalli	Hanumantarayankunte ...	496	39 4 0	Do
Lakshmidevikote ...	Dyavarakere	495	59 0 0	Do
Chandrahalli	Attikere	482	235 12 0	Do
Mosihalli	Mosilkere	500	174 12 0	Do
Dodakourahalli ...	Bhoginkere	464	113 4 0	Do

60

1901-1902

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

PETITION

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 11th January 1902

No. 1325-6 / P. F. 173-92

Sanctioning one-fifth remission of the assessment of the lands under certain private tanks in the Chintamani Taluk.

S.B.P.—27-1-02—200.

Rec. 735 of 18-3-90

4. On 13-3-90 the Diwan Sahib asked the Amildar to inform him when and who issued orders to grant Kodaipar remission of one-fifth of the revenue and the total produce of the lands below the tank and also to submit to him either the original order or a copy of it.

The Amildar was further asked to prepare and submit to him a statement showing

(1) the total Extent and assessment of the cultivated below the tank,

(2) the amount of Pancham Hike that was being paid to the Kodaipar

(3) the amount that was being credited to pot.

(4) the nos. into which the said Extent was formed during Survey

(5) their Extent and assessment

In addition to the above information the Amildar was also asked to enter a remark in the statement as to the condition of the tank.

Rec. 253 of 25-8-90.

5. The Amildar in submitting the statement reported to the Effect that the orders granting Pancham Hike in respect of the tank was not forthcoming - that when the petitioner was called upon to submit the order he deposed to the effect that Pancham Hike was being given since the tank was constructed, i.e about 150 years ago - that the pot for the tank as fixed in 1748 of the Era of

Vide deposition of 24-8-90

1740 ?

~~1748~~ 1825

Salvabanna - and that he had been - Enjoying it since then - that he had enclosed copy of the Sifarish presented by the petitioner that Pancham Hipe was being permitted till the year Vyaya - that he had enclosed copy of the Kaumbi Jaki account and the statement called for and that the tank was in repair.

6. On 9-9-90 the Dsan Supt forwarded the above proceedings to the Dy. Commr. and informed him that it seemed to him that there must be some more such Pancham Hipe - Dasavanda Kodaji tanks - that no explicit order had till then been received as to how the settlement ought to be conducted - that the Survey Supt. also did not seem to have taken notice of the matter owing to the absence of specific orders that it had been established from the Amildar's report and other correspondence that this was a long-standing Enjoyment

The Dsan Supt. also asked the Dy. Commr. what his object was in calling for the accounts of these tanks and how the matter had been disposed of and requested him to intimate to him the result of his investigation and that in case it had not been disposed of he might be favored with his views as to how the matter ought to be disposed of.

7. The Dy. Commr. after ascertaining from the Amildar when the accounts above referred to were submitted and getting a copy thereof

- Where & Correspondence

1886-87

No. 384 of 9-9-90

No. 169 of 20-5-92

by Mr. Kriekenbeek Supt. the late Dy.
Inspector by fixing a pedestal on all
belonging to the Ochahat of the above
and directing that after deducting
fifth Share due thereon on account of
wards from the Revenue the balance
should be credited to Govt. that he had
received the notice issued to him from the
Rajdroog Taluk on 17-9-93 calling
him to repair the said tanks and
warning him that if he failed to do so
road it would be resumed to Govt. that
accounts and pattas issued to private
persons through it would be seen that
road a was being deducted from time
memorial - and that this was dis-
continued after the Survey settlement which
Petitioner Sarvaji did and praying that
right be issued to grant him Rauham
according to inamdl from the year
which it was discontinued.

Duan
Survey Supt. after proceeding in
same way as in the above cases forwarded
Records relating to these tanks to the Supt.
Survey for effecting settlement according
to views of the Dy. Collector.

Nos. 379 of 5-9-90
Nos. 398 of 24-10-90
Nos. 580 of 9-12-90
+ Nos. 2 & 90 of 29-7-92.

following documents are in the file to show
Rauham Hike was being paid to Dasavandars
date 17-9-73 ceased to Koodapidar from the
Rajdroog Taluk
Supt. Kriekenbeek Nos. 79 of 2-5-68 (This is of the same tenor as one translated above)
date 1884-85
file 1886-69

of lands already given out on
As the land is of a small extent
to the Dasavandar for Kandayam
of per Kolaya from the year Vibh

The land should be measured
in the presence of Dasavanda
after telling from them a sum
to the effect that they would repay
and pay Kandayam annually
above rate. and a patti thereof
be submitted. The pattas shou
prepared and submitted person
during the Jamabandi.

The Dasavandars should be pa
corn on account of Dasavanda in
ways as is being done on lands alr
given out on Kandayam.

File No. 3 relates to Dyavar
No. 495 and Yerriagunte No. 5
Lakshmidevi Kote village.

14. On 2-9-90 Huddappa Shan
Chandra halli and Dasavandar
above tanks presented a petition
Deputy Supdt. stating that in cons
of his ancestors having built and
the above tanks at a large outla
-fifth of the revenue on lands belo
tanks and also of the Kolas produ
being given to them up to this year Vy
that this was withdrawn from the ar
[illegible] No. 79

23 · and the following as out of repair
6 Yerrakunte of Lakshmidevihole
Dyavarahore — do —
Attikere of Chandrahalli
Kammadikunte — do
Bidarakere of Doraspalli
Dannallanahalli Kere. Note. There is a remark against this tank to the effect that the tank is useful both for men and cattle as well as for cultivation - that the "Dwand'kaparadar" is ready to repair the tank - that during Survey one-fourth of the assessment on lands below it has been ordered to be remitted -

I moved to see the papers connected with the remissions granted at the Settlement in regard to this tank

The Shanbhog has certified that he has seen the actual condition of the above tanks - Why should not the Amildar certify as to the Amildar?

44 On 22-4-93 the Survey Supt observed that the Inaji Extent of land below Dyavara Kere belonging to Timmappa was 1-14-6¼ - that the Extent of land in Enjoyment according to Survey was 9a-28g and further lands - that the cause of Exceptions the Extent mentioned in the patta should be ascertained - that additional lands had been registered in the names of Boyi Timmappa and Enquired whether all of them were Dasavandars getting Kandaya Hisse on the authority of the same orders and whether all the holders of lands below the tank had been Enlarged and directed him to submit a detailed report on all the

No-2130/22-4-93

This is not quite clear.

tanks referred to in the statement. 25

The Survey Supdt. further observed that the Amildar reported that no orders were forthcoming about Yerrakunte of Lakshmi-devikote, Bidarakere of Subrayanpete and Hosakere of Srinivaspur and desired that it should be reported under what other authority the remission was granted to the grantee - also whether remission was being granted on lands below the tanks referred to in the statement up to the year of Survey Settlement and if so what was the amount remitted in respect of each tank.

45- On 12-6-93 the Amildar submitted a detailed statement of each tank with a table of the information obtained from the Shanbhogs and Inamdars. — No. 1020 of 12-6-93

46- Whereupon the Survey Supdt. asked the Amildar to furnish information on the following points

Who were the holders of lands below these tanks when the Kodagi dars repaired them?

Who agreed to hold these lands for Kandayam when they were given to Kodagi dars after they repaired them?

What are the nos. given to them for Kandayam?

— No. 3655 of 22-9-93

47- The Amildar in reply submitted a statement furnished in the matter by the Shanbhogs and stated that these Kodagi tanks were repaired many years ago — No. 47 of 1-2-94

50.

(General Serial No. 30.)

189 .

8

From

The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore.

To

The ~~Dy. Comr.~~ Supdt.
Rev. Survey.

Dated 11
Despatched 13 October 1892.
Received

Enclosures No. one

General No. 5061
Petn. No. 173—92

Calling for report as to how the prayer of the ryots of Chandrahalli &c villages, Chintamani Tk, for remission of 1/5 of the assessment on the lands below their private enterprise tanks, was disposed of by him.

References to be marked.

From the same No 623 of 2/11/92

The Supdt. Rev. Survey.

In forwarding the accompanying copy of report No. 636/135 dy 15th Augt. last from the Kolar Dy Comr., has the honor to request that the Survey Supdt will be good enough to report, for the information of Govt, how the prayer of the ryots of Chandrahalli &c villages, Chintamani Tk, for remission of 1/5 of the assessment on the lands below their private enterprise tanks, was disposed of by him.

By order

Draft. 11/8/09

Chief Secretary.

55 — (19) Ack 15th-91-C

Proceedings of the Board of Settlement.

~~Defence~~ Print

V. P. Madhavarao Esqr. C.I.E.

and

C. Seetharama Ayyangar Esqr.

Petitions Nos: 3336 & 1658 of 91-92

Subject

Claim to the remission of one-fifth assessment of the land under certain private Panchamalisse tanks in the Chintamani Talluk.

The facts of the case are clear from the following ~~decision~~.

Decision.

It appears from the records that while the remission of one-fifth assessment was claimed

Asst. for appt.
to be 1st & 2nd Commissioner
Mysore
20/12/1907.

Print

I agree with the Dewan that "Broken periods" is ruled upon as a true one that therefore the decision in the case of both tanks be effected during the current year. The tanks were so much [illegible] 22/12/07

in the case of lands under private tanks, the claimants in the case of two tanks (Yerrakunte and Bidarekere) have since abandoned their claim owing to the disrepair of these tanks and that in a third case the tank (Mozhukere in Nallamachanpalli) having been brought up to standard by the P.W.D. in 1881 the claim to remission is untenable

2. In the other 7 cases (~~vide list appended~~) it appears that the owners of the tanks were allowed one fifth remission till the Survey Settlement when the concession was withdrawn -

3 All these tanks with the exception of Chaidrahalli Marimakkere are reported

ಕ್ರ 159-91-97

ಕ್ರಮಾಂಕ
1655
3336

11-1-1902

(192)

[illegible]

By order

Asst.

for Secretary

C.M.